

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

The foregoing amendments to the claims are believed to place the claims into condition for immediate allowance or into better condition for consideration on appeal. It is respectfully believed that these amendments do not raise new issues that would require an additional search.

No new matter is added to the present application by the foregoing amendments, which are fully supported in the specification as originally filed. Accordingly, these amendments do not add new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-11, 14, 37 and 41-42 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the independent claim. Support for the amendment in claim 1 can be found on pages 6 and 71-72 of the specification. Support for new claims 41 and 42 can be found on page 32 of the specification.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

I. Objection to the Specification

In the Office Action at page 3, section 3, the specification was objected to for containing identical sequences with different SEQ ID NOs. Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to the fact that the sequences that the Examiner cites as being identical are different; the sequences of SEQ ID NOs. 9, 11 and 13 are amended while those of SEQ ID NOs. 3, 5 and 6 are not. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action at page 3, section 4, claims 1-11, 14 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. According to the Examiner, "there is no specific functional limitation for the claimed compounds." Office Action at 4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the above-captioned application, and solely in an effort to make that which was implicit explicit, Applicants have amended claim 1 in order to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner also rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing "to provide sufficient guidance and working examples on how to make and/or use such a broad of genus of linker and consequently fail[ing] to enable an artisan to make and/or use a compound comprising an undefined linker." Office Action at 4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the above-captioned application, Applicants have amended claim 1. This amendment by no means constitutes a disavowal of any part of the subject matter previously claimed in claim 1. Indeed, Applicants reserve the right to reclaim any such subject matter in a subsequent divisional or continuation application.

The Examiner also rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for claiming a compound in which the B fragment is a binding portion of PTH, but the binding specificity is not defined. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the above-captioned application, and solely in an effort to make that which was implicit explicit, Applicants have amended claim 1 in order to address the Examiner's concerns.

In view of the foregoing amendments and explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-11, 14 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lawrence B. Bugaisky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,203

Date: January 2, 2004

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
SKGF_DC1:212405.2